01	01	
02		
03	03	
04	14	
05	05	
06	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
07	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT SEATTLE	
08	MICHAEL B. FJERSTAD,) CASE I	NO. C08-0791-RSM-MAT
09	Plaintiff,	
10	II '	R RE: MOTION FOR
11) APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL UNITED STATES DRUG ENFORCEMENT)	
12	II /	
13	Defendants.)	
14	Plaintiff Michael B. Fjerstad submitted a motion for appointment of counsel. (Dkt. 9.)	
15	Defendants responded with a clarification that plaintiff erroneously indicates in his motion that an	
16	agency has determined that there is reasonable cause to believe that the allegations in his complaint	
17	are true. (Dkt. 10.) Having reviewed plaintiff's request, defendants' submission, and the	
18	remaining record, the Court finds and ORDERS as follows:	
19	(1) Pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(1), "[t]he Court may request an attorney to	
20	represent any person unable to afford counsel." However, there is no right to appointment of	
21	counsel in a civil case. See United States v. 30.64 Acres of Land, 795 F.2d 796, 801 (9th Cir.	
22	1986). Moreover, the Court may appoint counsel only in exceptional circumstances. Wilborn	
	ORDER RE: MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL PAGE -1	

v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th Cir. 1986). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the individual to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. *Id.* In this case, it cannot be said that plaintiff has demonstrated a likelihood of success on the merits, or shown that, in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved, he is unable to articulate his claims pro se. Accordingly, plaintiff's motion for appointment of counsel is DENIED. (3) The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to the parties and to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez. DATED this 4th day of August, 2008. United States Magistrate Judge

ORDER RE: MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL

PAGE -2